

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the pending Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 17 in order to clarify the subject matter of the invention and to overcome § 112 first and second paragraph rejections, and to overcome the objections to the drawings. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 6 and 17 may be found, for example, in Figs. 2-5 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1, 4-14 and 16-18 Under U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi et al. (USP No. 5,701,497) in view of Flores et al. (USP No. 6,370,498); and claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of Fujita, and further in view of Miyahara et al. (USP No. 6,314,213). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the above cited pending claims for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the present invention, claim 1 recites, in-part, a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data into another language; an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means in printed form...to output the translated document data by groups, each group of the translated document data comprising a printed document in the original language and printed documents of the translated document data translated in each of the plurality of languages with each of the printed documents being distinct from one another.

Similarly, amended claim 6 recites, in-part, a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data of a document into another language; an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means; ... to output the translated document data and the original language by groups, each group of the translated document data and the original language comprising a printed document in one of the original languages and printed documents of the translated document data translated in each of the plurality of languages with each of the printed documents being distinct from one another.

Furthermore, claim 11 recites, in-part, a translating apparatus wherein, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each of the first document data and the second document data into a first language and a second language, and controls said output unit so as to output the first and second document data translated into the first language as a first group and the first and second document data translated into the second language as a second group. and claim 14 recites, in-part, wherein, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate the document data in an original language into a first language and a second language, each being different from the original language, and controls said output unit so as to output the document data translated into the first and second languages as a common group of printed documents.

Claim 14 recites, in-part, a translating apparatus, comprising: a controller which controls a translating means so as to translate document data in an original language into a first language and a second language, each being different from an original language, and controls an output unit so as to output the document data translated into the first and second languages as a common group of printed documents.

Moreover, amended claim 17 recites, in-part, a translating apparatus wherein, when said input document data includes a first document data written in a first language and a second document data written in a second language, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate said input document data into at least one language, and controls said output unit so as to output the translated input document data and the first and second language data by groups, the first group of the translated document data and the first document data comprising a printed document in the first language and a printed document of the translated document data translated into the first language from the second language and a second group of the translated document data and the second document data comprising a printed document in the second language and a printed document of the translated document data translated into the second language from the first language.

Thus, one aspect of claims 1, 6, 11, 14 and 17 is that the translating apparatus translates document data from one language into one or more languages and outputs the results in a group of printed documents in each of the languages, with each of the printed documents being distinct from one another.

It is alleged that Yamauchi and Flores disclose the above recited feature. Yamauchi merely discloses outputting an original language and a translated document in pairs. For example, col. 4, lines 37-60 discuss how a document written in a first language is translated to a second language and output in a variety of ways as a pair of translations. However, Yamauchi fails to disclose the outputting of a group of printed documents consisting of the original document and the translated document data in each of a plurality of languages, each as separate documents.

In contrast, the present disclosure outputs documents in a group of documents having the original language and one or more of other languages. For example, as shown in Fig. 3 which corresponds to claim 1, original document A in one language is translated into languages B and C and output as a group of documents containing languages A, B and C.

Moreover, Figs. 4 and 5 of the present specification, which correspond to claims 6, 11 and 17 show a group of original documents consisting of page 1 (representing language A), page 2 (language B) and page 3 (language C) output as a group as an image of pages 1-3 all in language A. However, nowhere does Yamauchi disclose these features. Moreover, Flores fails to remedy this deficiency. Although it is alleged that Flores teaches the display of two or more separate languages, Flores fails to output a group of printed documents having a separate document in the original language and a plurality of other separate documents for each of the plurality of other languages, or a group of printed documents which have translated one or more languages into one different language and output the documents. As is clearly shown in Figs. 5A and 5B, Flores discloses only one document containing translated materials. As such, Flores fails to teach or suggest a translating device with each of the printed documents being distinct from one another, or separation or separate grouping of the translated documents from the original documents to make them distinct.

Accordingly, the combination of Yamauchi and Flores fails to disclose the limitation of claims 1, 6, 11, 14 and 17 to output the translated document data by groups, each group of the translated document data comprising a printed document in the original language and printed documents of the translated document data translated in one or a plurality of languages with each of the printed documents being distinct from one another. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of claims 1, 6, 11, 14 and 17 be withdrawn.

As is well known, in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974). As Yamauchi and Flores fail to disclose the above cited limitations, then based on the foregoing, it is submitted that Yamauchi, alone or in combination with Fujita or Flores does not render claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 17, or any claim dependent thereon obvious.

IV. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claim From Which They Depend Is Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claims 1, 6, 11, 14 and 17 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

V. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 09/593,060

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 21, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**